28

## I, Thomas F. Landers, declare:

- 1. I am an attorney at law licensed to practice before all federal and state courts in the State of California and a partner with Solomon Ward Seidenwurm & Smith, LLP ("SWSS"), counsel for Defendant OCMBC, INC. dba LOANSTREAM ("Defendant"). I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration. I submit this declaration in support of Defendant OCMBC, Inc.'s Statement in Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint ("Motion").
- 2. On August 7, 2024, at 12:48 p.m. Plaintiff's *pro hac vice* counsel first raised the issue of filing a first amended complaint ("FAC") via e-mail to me. Counsel's initial e-mail attached a copy of the proposed FAC, but it did not include any red lines. A true and correct copy of this email with redactions of unrelated commentary and omitting the lengthy attachments is attached as **Exhibit A**. August 7, 2024 was my 20<sup>th</sup> wedding anniversary, and I did not work the full day.
- 3. On August 8, 2024, I emailed Plaintiff's counsel requesting a red line version to facilitate review of the proposed new and changed allegations. A true and correct copy of this email with redactions of unrelated commentary is attached as **Exhibit B.**
- 4. On August 8, 2024, at 5:45 p.m. Plaintiff's counsel provided a red line version of the FAC via e-mail. A true and correct copy of this email is attached as **Exhibit C**. I promptly notified Defendant's management team of the request for a stipulation to file the FAC.
- 5. On August 14, 2024, Plaintiff's counsel emailed me asking whether Defendant would stipulate. I responded that I had sent the proposed FAC to Defendant's management team and "I do not yet know if my client will be willing to stipulate to such an incendiary filing." A true and correct copy of these emails with redactions of unrelated commentary are attached as **Exhibit D**.

28 | / / /

- 6. On August 16, 2024, I advised Plaintiff's counsel that Defendant would stipulate to the filing of the FAC and asked Plaintiff's counsel to forward an appropriate stipulation. A true and correct copy of this email with redactions of unrelated commentary is attached as **Exhibit E**. I received no response.
- 7. On August 23, 2024, I again reached out to Plaintiff's counsel requesting an appropriate stipulation. This time, Plaintiff's counsel responded, refusing to provide a stipulation and insisting on going forward with this Motion. I suggested Plaintiff's counsel rethink that position because he had not followed the local rules in filing the motion, but more importantly, the Court would appreciate and expect the parties to resolve the issue via stipulation. Plaintiff's counsel still refused to withdraw the Motion. Plaintiff's counsel claimed that proceeding via Motion versus stipulation was somehow necessitated by the timing of Defendant's discovery responses. True and correct copies of this email thread with redactions of unrelated commentary are attached as **Exhibit F**.
- 8. Defendant provided its discovery responses a week prior, on August 16, 2024 at 3:20 p.m., and those discovery responses specifically refute the allegations in the original complaint and the FAC. Those responses in the following statement, under oath, "Responding Party does not make telemarketing or solicitation telephone calls and did not contact plaintiff, nor did Responding Party contract with any vendor to make such calls and contact plaintiff. Responding Party is unaware of whether plaintiff was in fact called as alleged in the complaint, and if so, how plaintiff's telephone number came into the possession of whomever allegedly called her, including by plaintiff's prior consent."

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on August 29, 2024, at San Diego, California.

/s/ Thomas F. Landers
Thomas F. Landers

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 1 I hereby certify that on this 29th day of August, 2024, I electronically filed the 2 foregoing DECLARATION OF THOMAS F. LANDERS IN SUPPORT OF 3 DEFENDANT OCMBC, INC.'S STATEMENT IN RESPONSE TO 4 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED 5 **COMPLAINT** with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will 6 send notification of such filing to the following: 7 Counsel for Plaintiff 8 Dana Oliver OLIVER LAW CENTER, INC. 9 dana@danaoliverlaw.com **10** Anthony I. Paronich Pro Hac Vice Counsel for PARONICH LAW PC **Plaintiff** 11 anthony@paronichlaw.com 12 Andrew R Perrong Pro Hac Vice Counsel for 13 PERRONG LAW LLC Plaintiff 14 /s/ Woody Doolittle 15 Woody Doolittle 16 **17** 18 19 **20** 21 22 23 24 **25 26** 27

28

# **EXHIBIT A**

From: Anthony Paronich <anthony@paronichlaw.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 7, 2024 12:48 PM

To: Thomas F. Landers

Cc: Andrew Perrong; Woody L. Doolittle Subject: Re: Kimberly Hudson-Bryant v. OCMBC Inc.

Attachments: Bryant Loan Stream Proposed Amended Complaint -- 8.7.24.docx; Second Set of Discovery --

8.7.24.docx; Second Set of Discovery -- 8.7.24.pdf

Counsel:

Finally, a proposed Amended Complaint is attached. Please advise if your client will stipulate to it's filing, as it adds another defendant.

Anthony Paronich Paronich Law, P.C. 350 Lincoln Street, Suite 2400 Hingham, MA 02043 [o] (617) 485-0018 [c] (508) 221-1510 [f] (508) 318-8100

This email message may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient(s), or the employee or agent responsible for delivery of this message to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message from your computer.

# **EXHIBIT B**

From: Thomas F. Landers

Sent: Thursday, August 8, 2024 5:35 PM

To: **Anthony Paronich** 

Cc: Andrew Perrong; Woody L. Doolittle Subject: RE: Kimberly Hudson-Bryant v. OCMBC Inc.

Counsel:

Can you send me either a redline version of the FAC, or a Word version of the original complaint, and we'll create a redline version?

Thank you.

Thomas F. Landers | Partner Solomon Ward Seidenwurm & Smith LLP

401 B Street Suite 1200 | San Diego, CA 92101 o 619.231.0303 | d 619.238.4812 tlanders@swsslaw.com | www.swsslaw.com | v-card

Please read the legal disclaimer that governs this email and any attachments

From: Anthony Paronich <anthony@paronichlaw.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 7, 2024 12:48 PM To: Thomas F. Landers <tlanders@swsslaw.com>

Cc: Andrew Perrong <a@perronglaw.com>; Woody L. Doolittle <wdoolittle@swsslaw.com>

Subject: Re: Kimberly Hudson-Bryant v. OCMBC Inc.

Counsel:

Finally, a proposed Amended Complaint is attached. Please advise if your client will stipulate to it's filing, as it adds another defendant.

**Anthony Paronich** Paronich Law, P.C. 350 Lincoln Street, Suite 2400 Hingham, MA 02043 [o] (617) 485-0018 [c] (508) 221-1510 [f] (508) 318-8100

This email message may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient(s), or the employee or agent responsible for delivery of this message to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail message is strictly prohibited. If you have

# **EXHIBIT C**

From:	Andrew Perrong <a@perronglaw.com></a@perronglaw.com>
Sent:	Thursday, August 8, 2024 5:45 PM

To: Thomas F. Landers

Anthony Paronich; Woody L. Doolittle Cc: **Subject:** Re: Kimberly Hudson-Bryant v. OCMBC Inc.

**Attachments:** Bryant Loan Stream Proposed Amended Complaint with Redlines.docx

Please see attached.

On Thu, Aug 8, 2024 at 8:35 PM Thomas F. Landers <tlanders@swsslaw.com> wrote:

Counsel:

Can you send me either a redline version of the FAC, or a Word version of the original complaint, and we'll create a redline version?

Thank you.

Thomas F. Landers | Partner

### Solomon Ward Seidenwurm & Smith LLP

401 B Street Suite 1200 | San Diego, CA 92101

o 619.231.0303 | d 619.238.4812

tlanders@swsslaw.com | www.swsslaw.com | v-card

Please read the legal disclaimer that governs this email and any attachments

From: Anthony Paronich <anthony@paronichlaw.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 7, 2024 12:48 PM To: Thomas F. Landers < tlanders@swsslaw.com>

Cc: Andrew Perrong <a@perronglaw.com>; Woody L. Doolittle <wdoolittle@swsslaw.com>

Subject: Re: Kimberly Hudson-Bryant v. OCMBC Inc.

# **EXHIBIT D**

From:

Thomas F. Landers

Sent:

Wednesday, August 14, 2024 9:54 AM

To:

Anthony Paronich

Cc:

Andrew Perrong; Woody L. Doolittle

Subject:

RE: Kimberly Hudson-Bryant v. OCMBC Inc.

Counsel:

I also sent the management team the proposed first amended complaint. It was not initially well received, including because the new allegations against my client are false and appear to be a gross distortion of the February 2022 email produced by Elizabeth Stone. I do not yet know if my client will be willing to stipulate to such an incendiary filing. You appear to acknowledge that my client itself did not make the alleged calls, and that the party responsible for any alleged calling campaign was this Sean Roberts. You may want to consider dismissing my client and pursuing your claims against Mr. Roberts.

Thomas F. Landers | Partner

Solomon Ward Seidenwurm & Smith LLP

401 B Street Suite 1200 | San Diego, CA 92101

o 619.231.0303 | d 619.238.4812

tlanders@swsslaw.com | www.swsslaw.com | v-card

Please read the legal disclaimer that governs this email and any attachments

From: Anthony Paronich <anthony@paronichlaw.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2024 7:36 AM
To: Thomas F. Landers < tlanders@swsslaw.com>

Cc: Andrew Perrong <a@perronglaw.com>; Woody L. Doolittle <wdoolittle@swsslaw.com>

Subject: Re: Kimberly Hudson-Bryant v. OCMBC Inc.

Counsel:

Can you please provide a response?

Regards,

Anthony Paronich Paronich Law, P.C. 350 Lincoln Street, Suite 2400 Hingham, MA 02043 [o] (617) 485-0018 [c] (508) 221-1510

[f] (508) 318-8100

This email message may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient(s), or the employee or agent responsible for delivery of this message to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message from your computer.

On Wed, Aug 7, 2024 at 3:47 PM Anthony Paronich <a href="mailto:anthony@paronichlaw.com">anthony@paronichlaw.com</a> wrote:

# Counsel:

Finally, a proposed Amended Complaint is attached. Please advise if your client will stipulate to it's filing, as it adds another defendant.

Anthony Paronich

Paronich Law, P.C.

350 Lincoln Street, Suite 2400

Hingham, MA 02043

[o] (617) 485-0018

[c] (508) 221-1510

[f] (508) 318-8100

This email message may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient(s), or the employee or agent responsible for delivery of this message to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message from your computer.

# **EXHIBIT E**

**From:** Thomas F. Landers

**Sent:** Friday, August 16, 2024 3:20 PM

**To:** Anthony Paronich

Cc: Andrew Perrong; Woody L. Doolittle

Subject: RE: Kimberly Hudson-Bryant v. OCMBC Inc.

**Attachments:** 2024-08-16 Hudson-Bryant - Def OCMBC Resp to ROGS 1 from Plf (01752765xB5E99).PDF;

2024-08-16 Hudson-Bryant - Def OCMBC Resp to RFP 1 from Plf (01752890xB5E99).PDF

#### Counsel:

Attached are my client's discovery responses stating under oath that it had nothing to do with whatever this Sean Roberts was engaged in. If, despite these responses, you still want to assert the allegations in your proposed first amended complaint, my client will stipulate that leave be granted to amend. For the avoidance of doubt, my client denies the amended allegations against it, and believes they are being brought without evidentiary support and contrary to Rule 11(b)(3). You may want to consider adding appropriate conditional language to the new allegations against my client. My client reserves all rights, remedies and defenses. Please forward an appropriate stipulation for our review.

Thomas F. Landers | Partner Solomon Ward Seidenwurm & Smith LLP 401 B Street Suite 1200 | San Diego, CA 92101

o 619.231.0303 | d 619.238.4812 tlanders@swsslaw.com | www.swsslaw.com | v-card

Please read the legal disclaimer that governs this email and any attachments

From: Anthony Paronich <anthony@paronichlaw.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2024 1:32 PM
To: Thomas F. Landers <tlanders@swsslaw.com>

Cc: Andrew Perrong <a@perronglaw.com>; Woody L. Doolittle <wdoolittle@swsslaw.com>

Subject: Re: Kimberly Hudson-Bryant v. OCMBC Inc.

Counsel:

We have produced all documents. We are quoting our subpoena Schedule A to which she produced the responsive call records.

----

Anthony Paronich Paronich Law, P.C.

# **EXHIBIT F**

From:

Thomas F. Landers

Sent:

Friday, August 23, 2024 4:10 PM

To:

Anthony Paronich

Cc:

Andrew Perrong; Woody L. Doolittle

Subject:

Re: Kimberly Hudson-Bryant v. OCMBC Inc.

#### Counsel

My client's response to discovery is unrelated to your decision to file an amended complaint and your deadline to do so. You know that.

But, you've made your position clears

Thomas F. Landers, Esq.

- (t) 619-238-4812
- (f) 619-615-7912

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 23, 2024, at 15:57, Anthony Paronich <anthony@paronichlaw.com> wrote:

#### Counsel:

We feel like we've acted appropriately given our schedule and the amount of time your client took to respond to discovery. We have no problem with this email thread being presented to the Court, so please proceed as you deem appropriate. We've filed a motion and it appears that you don't have an opposition, so the motion should be granted.

#### Anthony

On Aug 23, 2024, at 6:41 PM, Thomas F. Landers <tlanders@swsslaw.com> wrote:

#### Counsel:

You may want to reconsider your position. First, you did not properly meet and confer pursuant to the local rules, which is grounds for denying your motion. Second, I did not reject your request for a stipulation. I told you I was discussing it with my client and that my client was upset at the false allegations against it. But I specifically told you that I did not know my client's position yet. Rather than waiting for me to get back to you, as required for a proper meet and confer, you preemptively filed your motion - long

before any deadline to do so. And, I got back to you before your deadline to file. Finally, the court will appreciate us to resolve this issue without its involvement.

ID #:204

The decision is yours. I know what I would do in your position, and I know what the court would appreciate, but if you insist on the court deciding your motion, you will force my hand in bringing all of the above to the court's attention as an explanation for why this was not resolved via stipulation.

Thomas F. Landers | Partner

Solomon Ward Seidenwurm & Smith LLP

401 B Street Suite 1200 | San Diego, CA 92101

o 619.231.0303 | d 619.238.4812

tlanders@swsslaw.com | www.swsslaw.com | v-card

Please read the legal disclaimer that governs this email and any attachments

From: Anthony Paronich <anthony@paronichlaw.com>

Sent: Friday, August 23, 2024 3:33 PM

To: Thomas F. Landers <tlanders@swsslaw.com>

Cc: Andrew Perrong <a@perronglaw.com>; Woody L. Doolittle

<wdoolittle@swsslaw.com>

Subject: Re: Kimberly Hudson-Bryant v. OCMBC Inc.

#### Counsel:

Despite us previously sending you the amended complaint, we had to file a motion to amend. So, at this point, we believe the appropriate course is you filing and notice of non-opposition and the Court ruling on the pending motion.

Anthony

On Aug 23, 2024, at 6:13 PM, Thomas F. Landers <tlanders@swsslaw.com> wrote:

#### Counsel:

I'm following up on my below email, and specifically the stipulation for leave to amend.

Thomas F. Landers | Partner

Solomon Ward Seidenwurm & Smith LLP

401 B Street Suite 1200 | San Diego, CA 92101

o 619.231.0303 | d 619.238.4812

tlanders@swsslaw.com | www.swsslaw.com | v-card

Please read the legal disclaimer that governs this email and any attachments

From: Thomas F. Landers

Sent: Friday, August 16, 2024 3:20 PM

To: Anthony Paronich <anthony@paronichlaw.com>

Cc: Andrew Perrong <a@perronglaw.com>; Woody L. Doolittle <wdoolittle@swsslaw.com>

Document 35-1

ID #:205

Subject: RE: Kimberly Hudson-Bryant v. OCMBC Inc.

#### Counsel:



Attached are my client's discovery responses stating under oath that it had nothing to do with whatever this Sean Roberts was engaged in. If, despite these responses, you still want to assert the allegations in your proposed first amended complaint, my client will stipulate that leave be granted to amend. For the avoidance of doubt, my client denies the amended allegations against it, and believes they are being brought without evidentiary support and contrary to Rule 11(b)(3). You may want to consider adding appropriate conditional language to the new allegations against my client. My client reserves all rights, remedies and defenses. Please forward an appropriate stipulation for our review.

Thomas F. Landers | Partner Solomon Ward Seidenwurm & Smith LLP 401 B Street Suite 1200 | San Diego, CA 92101 o 619.231.0303 | d 619.238.4812 tlanders@swsslaw.com | www.swsslaw.com | v-card

Please read the legal disclaimer that governs this email and any attachments

